

SUBSTANCE
OF
AN ADDRESS
DELIVERED BEFORE THE
MIDDLETOWN
COLONIZATION SOCIETY,

AT THEIR ANNUAL MEETING,

July 4, 1835.

BY WILLBUR FISK, D. D.
PRESIDENT OF THE WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.

Published by the Society.

MIDDLETOWN :
PRINTED BY G. F. OLMSTED.
1835.

Middletown, July 20, 1835.

DEAR SIR,

At the Annual Meeting of the Middletown Colonization Society Auxiliary to the American Colonization Society, holden on the 4th of July inst. the following Resolution was unanimously adopted.

"RESOLVED, That the Rev. Dr. Fisk be requested to furnish a copy of the address by him this day delivered, for publication: and that 500 copies be printed at the expense of the society "

We the undersigned, appointed by the society a committee to communicate the above Resolution, respectfully and earnestly beg your compliance with the same.

With high considerations of respect,
Yours, &c.

S. PYNE,
D. HARRISON,
I. WEBB.

REV. W. FISK, D.D.

GENTLEMEN,

Agreeable to the vote of the Middletown Colonization Society, and in compliance with your polite request, I herewith submit to your disposal the substance of my remarks, at the Society's anniversary on the 4th of July, instant. As I had committed to paper previous to its delivery, only a few heads of my speech, the committee and the audience who heard it, will of course make allowances for any variations in the *written* from the *spoken* address.— They will find, however, the same course of argument, and the *substance* of the remarks made on that occasion, in the address as now written out for publication.

With respect and esteem,
I am, Gentlemen,
Yours in sincerity,

W. FISK.

Wesleyan University,
July 29, 1835.

REV. S. PYNE,
DR. D. HARRISON,
I. WEBB, ESQ.

} Committee
of the
Middletown Colonization Society.

226
F 5435

380067

ADDRESS.

MR. PRESIDENT,

I rise to present, for the consideration of the audience, the following resolution—

Resolved, That it is the duty of all American citizens, on the ground both of patriotism and philanthropy, to aid by their countenance and their money, the cause of African Colonization.

I consider, sir, this anniversary of our nation's birth day, an appropriate occasion for investigating this subject. Every successive fourth of July ought, in my opinion, to be a type of the fourth of July, 1776. On this point, I cannot but think, that our fellow citizens often greatly misjudge. The fourth of July 1776 was not a day of military parade, of the clashing of arms, and the shout of the battle field; but it was a day of deep thought, of close investigation, of firm intellectual discussion, and lofty moral action. If, sir, we could look into the Congressional Hall of those patriots and heroes, who signed the Declaration of Independence, we should see, on every countenance, the index of the struggle of powerful yet intelligent moral feeling, nerving itself in its sternest mood, and fixing itself in the attitude of defiance, against injustice and oppression. We should see too, in the deliberations and decisions of that day, a judicious forecast to the future, and an intelligent examination of those principles and provisions, which were so indispensable to sustain the nation in her assumption of freedom and independence.

If such was the grand basis of the transactions of the fourth of July 1776; then sir, this day should be annually celebrated, not so much in mirth, in festivity, in bon-fires and the firing of cannons; nor yet so much in party political harangues and celebrations, as in the careful examination of the principles of our social compact, and of the means of our national security, improve-

ment, and happiness. This day should be our political sabbath, consecrated neither to Bacchus nor to Mars, but to the intellectual services of Freedom's altar; and hallowed by the sacred associations of Freedom's sanctuary. On such a day, what can be more important than to direct our attention to the colored population of our country. A population bearing to us such singular and opposite relations of identity and diversity; and withal constituting so considerable a proportion of the whole; and at the same time, about the treatment of whom, there is such a diversity of sentiments among ourselves; and between whom and the white population there is frequently such great jealousies and collisions of interest—a population, I say, of such relations to the nation, cannot fail to draw towards it, the attention and interest of every reflecting patriot and philanthropist. For on the final decision of the important questions mutually affecting them and us, will turn for weal or for woe, the momentous interests of this vast republic.

If this be a subject of such magnitude, it becomes a grave question with us—What can be done? or more properly, what can *we* do? For the question is not directly, what can others do, or what ought they to do? It is not what can our brethren in the South do, if they would; or what might the whole nation do, if each was ready to do his duty? But what ought we to do in this matter?

There are, sir, but two leading plans before the public, in reference to the object proposed. One is, the “American Colonization Society,” and the other is the “American Anti-Slavery Society.” There is, it is true, the “American Union, for the relief and improvement of the colored race.” Whether this Society will embrace the objects of both the other societies, or whether it will move in an exclusive sphere of its own, is not yet known. Its plans are not matured, nor are its modes of operation defined. If this society, or any other society or individual, can present a more feasible and efficient plan of doing good to this portion of our fellow beings, than is now before the public, all parties we trust, will co-operate with them. At present, however, the two Societies first mentioned, present the only combined system of operations, purporting to benefit the African

race. If then, we would act at all, on this subject, we must compare the claims and bearings of these two enterprises, and decide between them, according to the dictates of an enlightened understanding.

Before we proceed, however to show the comparative merits of these two societies, it may be necessary to answer an inquiry sometimes made, why the two societies—the anti-slavery and the colonization societies, cannot act harmoniously : or at least without collision and exclusiveness ? Why may not a man be both an abolitionist and a colonizationist ? Is there any thing incompatible between the two objects ? I know of no reason, sir, why a man may not be, at the same time, an abolitionist and a colonizationist. Indeed it is a fact that the great whole of the colonizationists are abolitionists. They desire and expect the final abolition of slavery ; and are impelled forward and cheered in their work, by this expectation. But, sir, we must take things as they are, and not as they might be—and the question, to be relevant to the present state of affairs, should be specifically this, Why may not a man unite in the present abolition movements of this country, and be at the same time, a colonizationist ? The answer is at hand : The course taken by abolitionists, renders it utterly impossible ; for a primary object with them, is to destroy the colonization enterprise. One of their first principles is that “ the extinction of the American Colonization Society, is the *first step* towards the abolition of slavery.” You are aware, sir, and probably this meeting are generally aware, that the Hon. Wm. Jay has lately written a book in opposition to the colonization enterprise, and in favor of the modern anti-slavery doctrine. This book seems to be a compilation of all the doctrines of modern abolitionism ; and is now generally received as the text-book of the party. On page 90, Mr. Jay says, “ The friends of humanity are called to meet it (the Colonization Society) with unrelenting hostility ; to labor without rest and without weariness, for its entire prostration.” This is mild, compared with some of the ravings of Mr. Garrison, the file leader of abolitionism in New England, against our Society.*

* Mr. Geo. Thompson, the *foreign* lecturer on slavery, who is considered a champion by abolitionists, moved and supported, at a late public meeting in Boston, the following resolution.

“ *Resolved*, That the principles and measures of the American Colonization

It is evident therefore that between the two enterprises, now before the public, there can be no amalgamation—no *peace*—no *truce* even—no moving onward together in fact, without direct “hostility;” for if we are to be assailed incessantly, “without rest and without weariness;” we must stand upon our defence and meet the attack, with *incessant* resistance. With this view, we come before the public to compare causes with the abolitionists; we compare principles and practices and fruits—which enterprise most favorably affects the interests of the man of color?

The benefits bestowed by either society, may be either *direct* or *indirect*. We will examine, in the first place, the direct influences of the two societies. The direct and immediate benefits conferred upon the people of color, must be either by emancipating the enslaved, or by meliorating the condition of either the enslaved or the free.

Now, sir, it ought to be particularly understood here, that *the anti-slavery society, has no direct and immediate bearing, upon the interests and condition of the enslaved*; either to secure their freedom, or to mitigate the rigors of slavery. They would not in fact, meliorate the condition of slavery, if they could. Any one who has read their publications, cannot but perceive, that they delight in finding and representing it, the worst possible. And alas! for human nature, this feeling of theirs has led them, in many instances, to draw “pictures,” either real or imaginary, of rare cases of enormous cruelty, and then to generalize the specific case, and apply the horrid characteristic, to the entire slave-holding South. Nay, some of their lecturers, have said publicly that one of the greatest difficulties in the progress of their principles, was the fact, that some of the slave owners treated their slaves with kindness. A meliorated condition of slavery, would be to them one of the most undesirable events that could occur. The knotting of the lash, the tightening of the cord, the oppressiveness of the slave legislation—in short, the grinding of the body and the soul of the slave to the dust, until

Society and its auxiliaries, are clearly shown to be at war with the best interests of Africa; opposed to the feelings of the colored population of this country, a fraud upon the ignorance and an outrage upon the intelligence and humanity of the community, and demanding the strongest public reprobation.”

his groans shall drive the mind of the humane and sympathetic to phrenzy, and the sufferers themselves to desperation, are the principal basis on which the anti-slavery society build their hopes of success. Herein may be seen the radical difference, between them and us. We hope by gradual amelioration, to elevate the oppressed colored man to his rightful standing in the great human brotherhood, without hazard and without civil convulsion; while they, on the other hand, consider such gradual alleviation of the condition of slavery, as tending directly to perpetuate the evil. They believe that immediate and unconditional emancipation, is the first step towards a mitigation of the evil; and that any intermediate step of approximation or alleviation, is delusion and base hypocrisy. In proof of this, we need only refer to their entire course of teaching and acting on this question. Now which course will be most likely to secure the desired object, with the least suffering and convulsion in the country, each man must judge for himself; and if he takes into view all the different bearings of the subject of slavery, in these United States, there can be but little doubt as to his final decision. Or if he chooses a shorter and safer way to decide the question, let him consult the New Testament, and see how far the apostle Paul differs from modern abolitionists! He was for making the yoke of slavery as light as possible; and for mitigating, by all the power of the gospel, the rigors of this existing relation of servitude; but they consider this, not only a fruitless, but a hypocritical course, and utterly subversive of the object they have in view. Modern abolitionism then has no direct influence to mitigate the rigors of slavery, it desires no such influence.

But, sir, I have said that the anti-slavery society has no immediate and direct influence, in the work of *emancipation*. The members of that society are none of them slave-holders—their constitution excludes such—hence they cannot liberate slaves themselves, in a private way. Can they do it in a public way, by legislation? It would seem not. The great theatre of this society's operations is in the non-slaveholding states. Now, sir, what have these states, in their legislative capacity, to do with the question of slavery in the slaveholding states? *Nothing*. What has the national legislature to do with it? *Nothing*. This

the abolitionists themselves acknowledge. "Congress," says Judge Jay, who is a civilian as well as an abolitionist, "has no more rightful authority to sit in judgment on southern slavery, than it has to legislate on the abolition of slavery in France."—Thus it appears, that the members of the abolition society, neither individually nor collectively, neither by private nor public action, can *immediately* and *directly* effect the liberation of slaves. As to purchasing the freedom of slaves, or freeing slaves by sending them out of the states, where the laws will not allow of emancipation, this would be an entire dereliction of abolition principles. The one would be an acknowledgement of *legal ownership*, and the other would involve the principles of *colonization*, either of which, according to the abolition code, would be a *moral crime*. Neither do they seem anxious to persuade *this* or *that* individual, to emancipate his slaves—this would be a kind of retail business, far below their plans of operation; and a species of gradualism, utterly inconsistent with their views of emancipation. The proposed operation and effects of their benevolence, are entirely of a *wholesale character*: any thing short of an entire and an immediate renunciation and abandonment of the *whole system* of slavery, is a business altogether too small, for their attention or labor. Since therefore this kind of emancipation can only be effected, by the slave owners, (unless it should be done by violence) it follows that the abolition society does nothing *directly* for the good of the slave, and their only chance for favorable action must be *indirectly*, through the agency of others. On the question then of a *direct* favorable influence on the slaves themselves, either in their emancipation, or the melioration of their condition, colonizationists have nothing to fear in a comparison with modern abolitionists.

We acknowledge, sir, that the direct and official operations of our Society, do not relate to slaves as such. The exclusive business of the society, in its direct official action, is "to colonize the free people of color, with their own consent." But, sir, the society embraces slave holders, as well as others, and many of its members have emancipated their slaves, for the express purpose of placing them under the action of this Society. Many doubtless who otherwise would

not have emancipated them. We could, if it were necessary, point out the names of the benevolent colonizationists who have at different times, emancipated hundreds of slaves. And we would point to Liberia herself, and show these emancipated slaves, in the possession, not of nominal merely, but of real freedom and independence. Colonizationists therefore, *have freed slaves*, and freed them also under the influence of Colonization principles, long before modern abolitionism had its being; and they continue to do this work still, while their opposers have not, to our knowledge, liberated a single slave.

I know, sir, we are sometimes tauntingly inquired of, by what rule of arithmetic we can calculate the final extinction of slavery, by colonization, if in 19 years, the colonization plan has removed but a small proportion of the nett increase of one year. We will solve this arithmetical question, sir, when our opponents will solve the following. If in the three or four years of modern abolitionism, not one slave has been emancipated by the society, or any of its members, how long will it take them in the same ratio, to emancipate all the slaves in the United States?

The truth is, sir, Colonizationists, when they cannot do all the good they would, are willing to do what they can; and knowing, as they do, that great and permanent enterprises generally have small beginnings, and at first a slow growth, they feel encouraged to proceed in their work, since they are doing an amount of good in the present tense, sufficient to compensate them a thousand fold for all their labor, and have good hope that they are laying the foundation of an enterprise, the benefits of which will be felt through all coming generations.

The balance then thus far, is abundantly in favor of colonization. And how, sir, do the two societies compare in respect to the melioration of the condition of the free people of color? If abolitionism has done much for the benefit of the free blacks, it is more than I know. Certainly they have not *excelled* in this work; much less have they been the *exclusive* laborers in this field. What schools have they established? Who have they educated? How far have they increased the intelligence or happiness of the great mass of the colored population? I know, sir, and you know, of scores and hundreds that they have ren-

dered more miserable ; between whom and the white population, they have, by their publications and harangues, excited heart-burnings and oppositions and mobs. Why is it that people of color are now, in so many instances, suspicious and restless and discontented, where they used to be confiding and happy ? For this, sir, we hold modern abolitionism responsible ; and however much its advocates may writhe under the charge, and attempt to repel it, *facts*, incontrovertible and glaring *facts*, fasten it upon them with the irresistible force of truth, and it cannot be shaken off. I criminate no man's motive in this matter ; they may imagine that by exciting the blacks to claim privileges that community are not yet prepared to award them, they shall thereby hasten the elevation of the colored race, to their proposed social and political equality. All this they may imagine—but it most evidently is a day-dream illusion. All analogy is against such a result, by such means—Bitterness, discord, a wider breach and a more invincible prejudice, must inevitably be the result of such a course. I express it, sir, as my sincere conviction, that, should the abettors of Garrisonism live to the age of Methusaleh, and spend that life, in well-directed efforts to do good, they could not make amends for the increased unhappiness of which they have been the occasion, to the colored population of the free states.

But, sir, what has *Colonization* done ? The direct and appropriate field of this society, is the elevation of the free man of color, to the high privileges of citizenship and independence. Of this she has her living witnesses in the happy and flourishing colonial republics, that stud the coast of Liberia. More are on the way. While I speak, the breezes of Heaven are wafting some of these nominal freemen, to the land where they can be free indeed and in truth.

It has been said, I know, sir, that this is a kind of elevation that the colored man does not choose, and therefore it cannot be reckoned to him as a blessing. But, in point of fact, this is not universally true. Many of them have chosen it, and others are stretching out their hands towards the land of promise, in numbers far beyond the society's means of conveying them thither. And many more would be anxious to go, even from New

England, but for the malign influence of these professedly exclusive friends of theirs, who have taken unwearied pains to prejudice their minds against the colony.* But, sir, have colonizationists been idle, in respect to the elevation of the colored man's character here? I know they have not, in their Constitution, an article like that in most Anti-slavery societies, binding the members to "endeavor to improve the character and condition of the free people of color"—and what would it avail if they had, provided it remained a dead letter, on their records.† But, sir, have colonizationists done nothing towards the education of colored persons? Have they been active in no case, in colored free schools and sabbath schools, in erecting African churches, and in exciting the whole colored population to mental and moral improvement? Who, at this moment, sir, is conducting a select school for colored young men, at his own risk and expense, in the town of Peterboro' N. Y.? Gerrit Smith, Esq. who is emphatically the colored man's friend, and a vice president of the American Colonization Society. Now although these things are not done in the *official* operations of our society, yet they are done by colonizationists; and they are in accordance with the spirit of colonizationism and promotive of its grand designs. So far then as the direct and immediate influences of the two enterprises are compared, we find the abolition plan doing nothing—yes sir, absolutely and unqualifiedly *nothing*, in the work of emancipating the enslaved, nothing in meliorating their condition; and very little good, but much harm, to the free: while the Colonization enterprise, without waiting for the future and for others to develop all its advantages, is elevating and cheering its beneficiaries, as it advances; and gives practical and immediate demonstration, of the safety, efficiency and philanthropy of its operations.

* In proof of this, I quote the following, from Matthew Cary's *Letters on Colonization* p. 8. "The first emigration of colored people from the U. S. to Africa, was conducted by Paul Cuffee"—"In the year 1815, he sailed from Boston, in a vessel of his own, and took with him nine families, containing thirty eight persons"—"Had he means, he might, in 1816, have taken 2000 from New England, as nearly the whole, were willing to take passage with him."

† Of about \$10,000 expended by the American Anti-Slavery Society the last year, not a single dollar is reported as expended to elevate the "free people of color." See a note on page 16.

We will now, sir, compare the two enterprises, in their indirect influences, that is, in their influences upon our fellow citizens, and the nation generally, to induce them to do justice to the colored race, both bond and free. This is claimed to be the appropriate work and strong hold of modern abolitionism. Here, if any where, colonizationists are to be distanced in the course of benevolence. Nay, sir, here abolitionists claim to be *the men*, and the *only men*, and with them wisdom and benevolence must perish. But sir, this is not the age, and we are not the persons, to allow of unsupported claims. "By their fruits ye shall know them—men do not gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles." What is proposed to be done by this indirect action upon the public mind? and how far have the measures pursued, accomplished the object? It is proposed to remove the remaining disabilities of the enfranchised, and to emancipate the enslaved.

The greatest and almost the only disabilities of the free colored people, in this country, are resolvable into what has been called, the prejudice of color. In combating this prejudice, the first inquiry should be, is it *vincible* or *invincible*? Does it exist in nature, or is it the effect merely of education and casual association? I am prepared to say, sir, that in my opinion, it is, to a certain extent, *natural* and *invincible*. But little argument is needed here. Our instincts, physical and moral, act independently of reasoning; and they dictate at once, that any thing like a social or domestic equality between the two races, never can be enjoyed. This, although it was at first taught by some of the abolitionists, seems now to be given up. Judge Jay is understood to say, p. 143, that for "white men to select black wives" is "an absurdity." If then there can be no intimate domestic union, no general and elementary bond of conjugal and parental ties, can any one suppose that there can be an equality and a homogeneous amalgamation, in the other grades of social and political combination? Never, sir, *never*. The strong and instinctive ties of sex and consanguinity, were evidently designed, by the God of nature, to be the elements of society. Remove these therefore, and political and social equality is visionary. Which shall be highest and which subordinate, must depend up-

on the comparative physical strength and intelligence of the two races; but invariably and directly, as the one rises, the other must fall. The abolitionists therefore have abandoned the only consistent ground for their object. They must set up for the conjugal union, and the domestic amalgamation of the two colors, or they must give up the inconsistent and chimerical idea of a social and political equality.

But, sir, I am willing to allow, that there is a great amount of existing prejudice which is educational and casual, and therefore may, in time, and by proper treatment, be removed. The question however is, which of the two societies, according to the character and bearing of their present operations, and the fruits of the past, is the most likely to remove this prejudice. I believe, sir, that all experience and all philosophy will bear me out in the position, that taste, whether it be inherent or casual, whether it be natural or associated, can never be changed, by a forcible intrusion of the undesirable object. Taste, to be corrected or formed, must be courted by palliatives, by gentle approaches, by calling the attention to other and more interesting aspects and qualities of the disagreeable object; and above all, by taking the object away from its offensive associations, and elevating it above those unlovely and disgusting conditions, in which it has been wont to be contemplated. During this process, care should be taken, to say little of the unreasonableness and criminality of the existing prejudice—much less should the subject of this supposed prejudice, be denounced and traduced and *commanded* even, by all the sanctions of moral obligation, to feel and act differently. Such a course would be likely to increase the prejudice; and *claims* upon us thus *set up* and *pressed*, would aggravate the disgust, and render the offensive object still more unwelcome and revolting. Every child feels the force of this principle, and all analogy sustains it.

And now, sir, for the application. Who does not know that the course above objected to, has been the very one pursued by the abolitionists? And what has been the effect? precisely what might have been anticipated. The effects upon the colored population have already been alluded to—They have had their expectations raised, and have been induced to set up claims in social in-

tercourse, which the community were not prepared to accord to them: This has led to the most unhappy distrust and collision of feeling. Offensive claims pressed upon the public taste, have been responded to, by increased prejudice, and in some instances, by violent resistance. Hence the mobs of New York and elsewhere. Sir, no man, I believe, holds mobs in more utter abhorrence than myself, or dreads more their ultimate effects upon our social and civil institutions; and hence I would the more deprecate the imprudence of good men, who have been injudiciously instrumental in exciting them. The public taste, when it is outraged, revolts against the offensive cause. Grant if you please, sir, that all this is wrong, that the prejudice itself is wrong, and ought to be corrected; but are these the men and this the remedy, to correct the public taste, and remove the unfavorable prejudice?

We have heard much, sir, of the Connecticut "black-law" as it has been termed. And I frankly declare I do not now, I never did, approve of that law. But, sir, in what did that law have its origin? It was in this same system of forcing public taste—The obstinacy with which an offensive community was urged upon people who desired it not, has led to an increase of prejudice and opposition to the colored people, in the State of Connecticut, far beyond all former precedent.* The more the disease is attempted to be cured, in this way, the worse it will grow. And hence the more important is it, that the practitioners in such palpable and ill-omened empiricism, should be discountenanced.

Such, sir, is the abolition process, and such the results of that process, for removing the disabilities of the people of color. On the other hand, what has *colonization* done, and what is it doing to remove those disabilities? It has been objected to our Society, that it had its origin in prejudice, and that it strengthens and fosters that prejudice. African Colonization is predicated on the principle, that there is an utter aversion in the public mind, to an amalgamation and equalization of the two races: and

* The same result is seen in an act of a late State Convention in N. Carolina, by which it is proposed to make it unconstitutional, for men of color to enjoy the right of suffrage.

that any attempt to press such an equalization is not only fruitless, but injurious. It is predicated also upon the further principle, that so far as existing prejudice is vincible, it is so only, as has been already stated, by slow degrees, and by elevating the victims of prejudice, from their degrading associations and conditions. Hence this society lifts up the man of color, at once, from his connections and disabilities; and places him beyond the influence of the shackles of prejudice, and teaches him to act and feel as a man. She teaches him self-government, she bids him rear cities, and build ships, and spread abroad his commerce, and lay deep and extended, the foundations of his social and political institutions, and thus give practical demonstration, to his oppressors and despisers, that he is "a man and a brother." Is this fostering prejudice? I know not, sir, which astonishes me most, the charge that the Colonization Society is the organ and support of a wicked prejudice, or the claim, that the anti-slavery society is successfully employed in breaking down that prejudice. Before I can believe either the one or the other, I must learn to invert principles and facts, and call contradictions, consistent truths.

Finally, sir, let us proceed for a few moments to compare the influence of the two societies upon the public mind, in mitigating the condition of the *slave*, and in *setting him free*. It has already been shown, that the anti-slavery society has no influence in mitigating the rigors of slavery, it desires no such influence: But such an influence the Colonization Society has. By its official operations, and by its official agents this influence is indirectly exerted. Every instance of the elevation of the man of color, has a tendency to loosen the cords of the slave. Every plea for injured Africa, and every rational sympathy excited for her exiled sons, among slave-owners, has the same tendency. And how many pleas have thus been made, and how many sympathies have been excited by the Society's Advocates! and that too, not where sympathy would be comparatively unavailing, but in the very heart of slavery. The voice of a Bascom, and a Finley, and a Breckenridge and others, have been heard through the entire South, pleading for the elevation of these victims of prejudice and oppression. Nor were they heard in vain: a

general interest was beginning to be felt, and the work of alleviation was gradually advancing, until an ill-timed, precipitate benevolence began to urge forward its high pressure system of agitation and excitement. This has increased the severity of slave legislation; it has silenced the voice of discussion in the slave states, and has checked and retarded, perhaps for years, the progress and final consummation of slave amelioration and emancipation.

Never did men take a more inapposite course to accomplish their object, and never did the results of a plan prove more unpropitious to the planners.

Whose co-operation have they conciliated? Not the colonizationists certainly, for they cast us off, at the very onset—they have prosecuted against us, “without rest and without weariness,” a war of “unrelenting hostility.” Is not this a most impolitic step, and well calculated to bring the managers of this society into suspicion of incompetency to manage such an enterprise? They have thus arrayed against themselves eight tenths of the intelligence and influence of the entire north, and they find themselves under the necessity of exhausting all their resources in maintaining an unequal contest which they have gratuitously drawn upon themselves. They now are called upon, as they think, to spend tens of thousands of dollars* annually, to support lecturers, domestic and *imported*, and to circulate periodicals and books, for the purpose of producing a healthy

*The abolitionists boast that between 20 and 30 thousand dollars have been received the present season for their object. This is doubtless to be expended as the \$9831.29 were expended last year, viz.

Salaries for agents and others,	3,683 64
For the Emancipator (an anti-slavery paper),	2,614.75
Printing, Engraving, Books &c,	2,454.25
Office expenses,	587 34

9,339.98

The balance was expended in “public meetings” and “sundries” excepting \$109.67 in “slave suits.” Most of this was expended to oppose the Colonization plan, by papers and lectures. And as the “extinction” of our Society, “is the first step towards the abolition of slavery,” it seems they have not yet advanced *one step*, in their work. And since the Colonization enterprise has blazed with brighter luster the past year, than in any preceding year, how much time and money must they expend, in the same ratio, before they take the “first step,” in the abolition of slavery? Which is best, gradual emancipation already commenced and advancing, or *immediate abolition*, the first step of which, is likely *never to be taken?*

tone of public feeling in the North. And a healthy tone of public feeling is *to feel as they do*. And to bring us into this healthy tone of feeling, they have declared war upon us, and denounced us as "apologists for slavery," and partakers with man-stealers and robbers. It is thus this society has commenced its career of benevolence; and it is thus they prosecute the work of conciliating public opinion and co-operation in the North.

And do they use a kindlier language and pursue more conciliatory measures in reference to the South? Not at all. Towards all the slaveholders, and the slaveholding states, they are ringing all the changes of denunciation, and all the forms of anathematizing, without mitigation, qualification, or exception.—They assume that independent of all circumstances, every slaveowner is guilty of kidnapping, robbery and theft: and each of the slaves ought to be immediately set free.* And how has this course succeeded with the South? It has raised against them the indignation and most inveterate opposition not only of those who advocate slavery from principle, but of those also who were looking, praying and laboring for the redemption of the enslaved. The christian and the infidel, the slaveholder and those who have none, the rich and the poor, are all driven, as by a common impulse, into one consolidated array of opposition against these doctrines and their advocates. Had I time and were it necessary I could bring up numerous and overwhelming testimonies in proof of what I assert. These, sir, are the results of abolitionism in the South. It is thus that public opinion is acted upon to effect indirectly the abolition of slavery. Better sir, to say it effects emancipation *inversely*. Every stroke thus aimed at slavery, only rivets the fetters of the slave, and drives the iron deeper into his soul.

But it is said the result will ultimately be favorable, and therefore they are encouraged to persevere. But on what principles do they calculate upon these favorable results? Certainly not from what they see—certainly not from any known laws of the human mind. The truth is, there are certain principles and

* And yet Judge Jay tells us, that "many may conscientiously, doubt whether immediate emancipation is safe or wise." What? and still morally obligated to emancipate immediately? what a moral code is this?

practices connected with this abolition enterprise, that must always render it unproductive of good, but abundantly fruitful in mischief. Let us notice more particularly a few of these.

In the first place, the anti-slavery movements tend directly to political action and political partisanship. This has been avowed by the leaders in this enterprise; and it has already begun to be acted upon, in the elections. Why, sir, to go no further, we have had in our own county, a political anti-slavery meeting, called to proscribe, at the polls, a gentleman, now present, who is probably as much opposed to slavery as themselves, because he thought it not prudent at the last session of congress to vote on a question connected with slavery exactly in accordance with their views. A political anti-slavery party will doubtless soon be organized, and when once this is made a question at the polls, its moral bearings will be lost sight of. If such a political party should succeed, nothing short of a dissolution of the union will follow. Let no man flatter himself, that the South would not be inclined to revolt from the union, or would not *dare* to do it. The South, sir, *dare* do any thing, she is *inclined* to do; and there is nothing, she would be more inclined to do, than to separate herself from the northern states, whenever they assume a political attitude in opposition to her social and political rights—rights that were guarantied to her, by the solemnities of constitutional provisions, and publicly plighted faith. Any political interference of ours in that matter would to all intents and purposes, on this question, be a foreign interference, and therefore would be improper and injurious.

This last remark, sir, may remind us probably of another feature, in the indirect operations of the anti-slavery society, and a feature too, which has rendered their operations extremely suspicious. *They have asked and obtained foreign aid to assist them in their process of agitation and excitement, on the question of Southern slavery.* This is truly very *indirect* action. British lecturers act on the north to induce the north to act on the south, to influence the south to liberate their slaves. Perhaps, sir, it is supposed, that by the increase of the machinery, they will gain a proportionate increase of power. But there is sometimes as much lost in friction as is gained in power. This is most evidently a case of that

kind. A foreign interference, on this question will grate very harshly on American feeling. The reminiscences of this anniversary teach us, that, however much we love and honor England in her place, we should be extremely jealous of any interference from that quarter, in matters affecting our constitution and laws.—Nor do I believe that a high minded Englishman of intelligence and moral principle, having an honorable standing and an honorable calling in his own country, would volunteer to come to America on such an errand. What then are we to think, if such a foreign agent should not only come but should also prosecute his mission, in the most offensive manner, arraigning our institutions, denouncing our greatest and best men as conniving at “fraud” and “outrage,” supporting and urging forward measures, calculated to divide our churches, produce insubordination in our theological and literary institutions, and prostrate our political union? Why, sir, we must suspect the soundness either of his head or his heart. And what if such a foreign agent should either procure or suffer himself to be announced, as a Reverend Clergyman; and under such a character, should accept of invitations to officiate in the sacred desk as a minister of the gospel, although he neither had had the hand of Bishop or Presbyter on his head, nor held a ministerial license in his hand? In such a case, sir, we must lose all confidence in his sense of propriety and integrity. And if to this were added communications from his own country, and I speak not unadvisedly, that such an agent was a bankrupt in purse and in character at home, this would be only confirmatory of suspicions naturally excited by his conduct here. Desperate fortunes and reputations require desperate means to repair them. If I were a foreigner and had no honorable calling, or *safe* public standing at home, and wished to go abroad, under a competent salary, to get a morsel of bread, and gain a transient reputation, especially if I had some power at declamation, to attract the attention and excite the wonder of the multitude, I know of no place more tempting than this country, and no theme more promising for this purpose, than that of slavery.

But, sir, not only does the course pursued by the abolitionists, tend to alienate the different parts of our political union from

each other, and break up our national compact ; it also has a most direct and pernicious bearing upon the peace and integrity of our churches. Their course is proscriptive, exclusive and denunciatory. At a late *protracted* anti-slavery meeting in Boston, it was moved and carried, with acclamation, and as I am informed, without a dissenting voice, that all ministers and church members of the South, who are the owners of slaves, ought to be excluded from our pulpits and from our communion. Now, sir, let this doctrine be carried out, and what would be the consequence ? The most ruinous to the peace of the churches. The Congregational churches from the independent character of each individual society or association, would not be so seriously affected. The Baptists would feel it more. But these would not feel it like the Protestant Episcopalian, the Presbyterian and the Methodist Episcopal Churches. It would be an entire dismemberment of these churches—not merely a grand division into northern and southern, but here in the north, we should be divided among ourselves, brother against brother, and society against society ; and the work of God would be neglected and the spirit of devotion lost, in the schisms and contentions that would ensue. As is natural, sir, I fix my mind on what, in such an event, would be the condition of my own church, and I shrink back from the contemplation, with an anguish bordering upon horror. No church would suffer like ours—We are not only bound together by a common faith, a common discipline, and common ecclesiastical judicatories, but we are united also by a common pastoral charge, by which the whole flock is, in a manner, the property of each and every pastor, and each and every pastor is the property of the whole flock. Throw this spirit of disfellowship and schism into a religious community thus constituted, extending as it does, over our whole Union, and what would be the result ? I know not, sir, but there may be zeal and infatuation enough among abolitionists, to rejoice at such an event ; but I believe, that, aside from them, even infidels would weep at the consequences political, social and domestic that would follow such a schism. I say *political*, for there can be no doubt that our social and political bands are greatly strengthened, by the religious and ecclesiastical ties, that bind together the different

parts of our country. I am no advocate, sir, for a union of church and state, but I am an advocate for strengthening our social and political bonds, by the powerful and hallowing cement of christian sympathy and fellowship. Yet this cementing influence would be lost, and numerous other and greater evils would follow if this doctrine of the abolitionists should prevail. Let no one imagine, sir, that this measure of excommunicating all slaveowners from the offices and ordinances of the church, is not an *essential* feature in modern abolitionism, and is only maintained by a few of the most infatuated. It is held every where, in all their official documents, their lectures and their books. In fact the very starting point of abolitionism is, that to hold a slave, in *any* and *every* case, is a sin—a heinous, notorious, crying and almost unparalleled sin. Hence the duty, in *all* cases and regardless of all consequences, of *immediate* emancipation.* It is needless to quote testimony to show that this is their doctrine, for none of them will deny it; it is the grand substratum of all their operations, and the universal premise, for all their reasoning. And if this be correct can abolitionists commune with these sinners? Can they administer the ordinances to them? Can they hear them preach? Nay, sir, can they hold a church relation with such sinners? And since, to countenance sin and sinners, is to be accessories, in the first degree, to wickedness,

* Many have been caught, by the specious though sophistical manner of reasoning, on this subject. That the system of slavery is morally wrong, almost all are ready to acknowledge—Having gained assent to this proposition, then the sophistical lecturer immediately gives the proposition a distributive and an individual application, and says “since you acknowledge that slavery is sin, and must also acknowledge that every sinner should stop sinning *immediately*, irrespective of all consequences, therefore it is the duty of *every* slave-holder *immediately*, and irrespective of circumstances and consequences, to emancipate his slaves. This is *crooked logic*. The best way perhaps to straiten it is to give an illustration.

The eccentric Lorenzo Dow, lately deceased, had, by building a mill-dam across a stream, flooded his neighbor's grounds, above the dam. They commenced a suit against him, and obtained a verdict, in their favor, on the principle that he was invading their rights. This verdict convinced Lorenzo, that every moment he kept the water in its pre-ent position, he was guilty of a legal sin; and on the ground that every man should *quit sinning immediately*, he at once became a convert to the doctrine of immediate abolition. He accordingly went to work and forthwith abolished (or demolished) his mill-dam. The *immediate* consequence of letting out so large a quantity of water at once, was the deluging of the country below; and a great destruction of property. And Lorenzo was taught, by a second prosecution and assessment of damages, that his *immediate abolition* had led him into a *greater sin*, than he was guilty of before. Immediateist? Mutatis mutandis, de te fabula narratur.

all of us who defend our brethren of the south, against such proscriptive measures, must ourselves also be proscribed, as "apologists for slavery" and partakers of its sins. And this spirit and these doctrines, as they are the very foundation of this anti-slavery agitation, the theoretical basis of the whole system, have also begun to be adopted in practice. Some churches have passed resolutions in accordance with these doctrines, and the agitators are urging others to the same course. I have myself recently witnessed, in a high and extended ecclesiastical tribunal, the practical operation of this proscriptive spirit.

Now, sir, let every candid man ask himself the question, whether such measures, prosecuted with such a spirit, will ever directly or indirectly, operate favorably for the interests of the man of color, either bond or free? If he is constrained to answer in the negative, then, if he loves his country and would do her service; if he feels for the colored man and would relieve him of his disabilities and oppressions, let him turn to the other glorious alternative—THE AMERICAN COLONIZATION SOCIETY. Here are channels for his benevolence; here is an organization efficient and operative, for his co-operation.—Let him put his hand to this work, as one that not only *needs* but *claims* his aid—claims it on the high principles of justice and benevolence; claims it, by the united voice of patriotism, of philanthropy, and of religion. Nay, sir, I may say, that this enterprise claims our attention and support, at this moment, on the ground of its being the only safe and efficient corrective of the phrenzied spirit, and ruinous system of modern abolitionism.

I have attempted to show, that the anti-slavery society does not benefit the colored population even indirectly. There is a way however, pointed out by a speaker who preceded me,* in which this society may indirectly benefit, and has in some instances benefitted, the colored race—By stirring up a greater zeal, in the colonization cause. Such has been the effect in our own city—We once, it will be recollected, made an effort to form a Colonization Society in this place. But we could not among the gentlemen of the place, even after hearing a lecture from the

* Professor D. D. Whedon.

estimable and eloquent Secretary of the parent society, raise interest enough to organize an auxiliary. I say among the *gentlemen*; for the ladies of the city, to their honor be it spoken, (and the ladies, sir, as you know, are generally first in every good work) have long had a society in successful operation—the earliest in Connecticut, if not in New England. What our friends could not do for this cause, however, as was well remarked by the speaker before alluded to, its enemies have accomplished for us. Anti-slavery lecturers, with their *cow-skins* in their hands, have lashed us up to this duty.* There are some indications, sir, that we need a second chastising of this kind. We need more interest, more zeal, more liberality in this work. The Society, in the language of the resolution, needs our “*countenance and our money.*” It is increasing the facilities and comforts of the colony, it is rectifying former mistakes, enlarging and improving its plans, paying off its debts, at the same time it is defending itself against slander and opposition, at home and abroad. The laborers, in this work, like the ancient Jews, have to build the wall with one hand, while they bear their weapons of defence in the other; and shall we, at this time of trial and of exigency, stand aloof, or put our hand to the work feebly and inefficiently? Sir, it must not be—the contributions of this day, and our labors and munificence in this cause hereafter, will show, I trust, that we are faithful and efficient friends of that noble enterprise, which is laying a foundation for the future independence of the degraded, oppressed and exiled sons of *abused and bleeding Africa*.

* An anti-slavery lecturer from New York visited Middletown and gave a most violent harangue on abolition and colonization and to give greater force to his arguments and gesticulation he ever and anon flourished a green cowhide whip.